UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,277	04/19/2004	Jeyhan Karaoguz	1875.4890000	9921

26111 7590 03/10/2008

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
HANCE, ROBERT J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/826,277	KARAOGUZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT HANCE	4134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/02/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The information disclosure statement filed 08/02/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 6-12, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0148632.

As to claim 1, Park et al. disclose an integrated control system for control of distributed home entertainment electronic devices (Abstract; Fig. 1), comprising: a controller(200) for managing the operation of said integrated control system (Paragraph

44-45); a translator coupled to said controller for translating management instructions into management messages using a preferred communications protocol(Wireless protocol or IEEE 802 or Bluetooth, Paragraph 158) (Paragraph 42-47, 60-62 – after receiving remote control commands, set top box 100 refers to memory 160 to see how to encode command. Command is then sent wirelessly – see Fig. 2: 110 and Paragraph 157-158. This message is translated and encoded to be sent over the wireless network.); a device database coupled to said controller for storing device information (Paragraph 62); at least one communications interface coupled to said controller for transmitting and receiving management messages to distributed home entertainment electronic devices (Figs 2-5; Paragraph 44 – 48 all appliances are connected via wireless LAN).

As to claim 2, Park et al. disclose the integrated control system of claim 1, wherein said at least one communications interface includes a wireless interface (Paragraph 44; Fig. 3-4).

As to claim 6, Park et al. disclose the integrated control system of claim 1, wherein said at least one communications interface includes a wireline interface (Paragraph 48 – system can use HPNA over existing telephone wires).

As to claim 7, Park et al. disclose the integrated control system of claim 6, wherein said at least one communications interface includes a powerline interface (Paragraph 49).

As to claim 8, Park et al. disclose the integrated control system of claim 1, wherein said at least one communications interface includes both a wireline and a wireless interface (Paragraph 48; Figs. 1-2).

As to claim 9, Park et al. disclose a method to control distributed home entertainment electronic devices, comprising: (a) receiving a remote control signal (Paragraph 44 and 61); (b) interpreting said remote control signal (Paragraphs 45 and 61); (c) gathering device information for devices impacted by said remote control signal (Paragraph 60-62); (d) translating said remote control signal into a management command (Paragraph 61-62 – data about the corresponding appliance is read and the proper management command is created); (e) encoding a management message based on the management command (Paragraph 60-62; Paragraph 72, Figs. 3-4 - controller 230 generates a control signal in response to a remote control command. Appliances are connected to set top box through wires or wirelessly, as described in Paragraph 158-159); and (f) transmitting said management message (Paragraph 60-62; Paragraph 72, Fig. 4 – appliances are connected to the set top box through wires or wirelessly).

As to claim 10, Park et al. disclose the method of claim 9, wherein said device information includes a type of communication protocol supported by a device (Paragraph 62 – memory contains IR protocol information for each appliance).

As to claim 11, Park et al. disclose the method of claim 9, wherein said device information includes a unique identifier for a device that can be used to route management messages (Paragraph 60, 62 – memory contains IDs of appliances).

As to claim 12, Park et al. disclose the method of claim 9, wherein step (e) includes encoding a management message using a wireless protocol (Paragraph 158).

As to claim 16, Park et al. disclose the method of claim 11, wherein said wireless protocol is Bluetooth (Paragraph 158).

As to claim 17, Park et al. disclose a method to provide hierarchical control of distributed home entertainment electronic devices, comprising: (a) receiving a remote control signal (Paragraph 61); (b) interpreting said remote control signal (Paragraph 61); (c) gathering device configuration information for devices that may be impacted by said remote control signal (Paragraph 60-62); (d) determining management command based on said remote control signal and said device configuration information (Paragraph 61-62 – data about the corresponding appliance is read and the proper management command is created); (e) encoding a management message based on the management

command (Paragraph 60-62; Paragraph 72, Fig. 4 - controller 230 generates a control signal in response to a remote control command. Appliances are connected to set top box through wires or wirelessly, as described in Paragraph 158-159); and (f) transmitting said management message (Paragraph 60-62; Paragraph 72, Fig. 4 – appliances are connected to the set top box through wires or wirelessly).

3. Claims 19-21, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Russ et al., US Pub. No. 2002/0059642.

As to claim 19, Russ et al. disclose a method for distributing video signals from a first electronic device receiving multiple video streams to a second electronic device (Paragraph 21-22; Fig. 1; 1A – set top box 100 connects to head-end service provider 1 which supplies multiple video streams. set top box 100 distributes video signals to computer 101), comprising: (a) receiving a video channel request (Paragraph 25 – remote control commands in response to user input are sent to set top box; Fig 2; Paragraph 39 – tuner 210, which is connected to remote control receiver 225, tunes to a selected channel); (b) encoding a video message that contains video from the requested video channel (Paragraph 22-24; Paragraph 41); (c) transmitting the encoded video message from the first electronic device to the second electronic device (Paragraph 22-24; Paragraph 41).

As to claim 20, Russ et al. disclose the method of claim 19, wherein said first electronic device is a cable set top box (Paragraph 22).

As to claim 21, Russ et al. disclose the method of claim 19, wherein step (b) comprises encoding a video message using IEEE 802.11(b) protocol (Paragraph 24).

As to claim 24, Russ et al. disclose the method of claim 19, wherein step (b) comprises encoding a video message using Bluetooth (Paragraph 24).

As to claim 25, Russ et al. disclose the method of claim 19, wherein step (b) comprises encoding a video message using a powerline protocol (Paragraph 25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-5 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0148632 in view of Willes et al., US Pub. No. 2005/0117052.

As to claims 3-5 and 13-15, while Park et al. disclose that communications conform to the standards in the IEEE 802.11 family and other wireless protocols (Paragraph 155), they do no specifically state which standards are being used. In an analogous art, Willes et al. disclose a wireless video distribution network which employs IEEE protocols 802.11b, 802.11e and 802.15.3a (Paragraph 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the wireless protocols disclosed by Willes et al. in the home entertainment control system of Park et al. The motivation for this combination would have been to not limit the system to any one type of communication protocol (Park Paragraph 158). All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akaiwa et al. US Patent No. 6,741,240 in view of Park et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0148632.

As to claim 18, Akaiwa et al. disclose: within a home entertainment system, a method of automatically configuring the electronic device upon a change in a video input signal (col. 4:8-20); comprising (a) determining a change in a video input signal (col. 8:3-11); (b) analyzing the characteristics of the video input signal (col. 4:39-64 – signal information detector 131 detects signal information including refresh rate, tracking

information and resolution information); (c) determining whether settings of the electronic device should be changed (col. 4:8-20 - determining device 50 determines whether or not to change settings); (d) when settings should be changed, generating management messages for the device to be changed; and (e) transmitting said management message (col. 6:45-59; Fig. 1 – determining device 50 is connected to adjusting device 40, which causes display changes when needed, as determined by determining device 50).

Akaiwa et al. fail to disclose a system containing multiple electronic devices. However, in an analogous art, Park et al. disclose a system comprising a broad array of electronic devices (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have multiple electronic devices, as disclosed by Park, use the automatic television settings adjustment disclosed by Akaiwa et al. The rationale for this combination would have been to automatically adjust video signals for use in a range of devices with different inputs. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

7. Claims 22-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ et al., US Pub. No. 2002/0059642 in view of Willes et al., US Pub. No. 2005/0117052.

As to claims 22-23, while Russ et al. disclose that communications conform to the standards in the IEEE 802.11 family and other wireless protocols (Paragraph 24), they do no specifically state which standards are being used. In an analogous art, Willes et al. disclose a wireless video distribution network which employs IEEE 802.11e and 802.15.3a (Paragraph 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the wireless protocols disclosed by Willes et al. in the video distribution system of Russ et al. The motivation for this combination would have been to not limit the system to any one type of communication protocol (Russ Paragraph 24).

As to claim 26, In an analogous art, Willes et al. disclose a video distribution network which conforms to an Ethernet protocol (Paragraph 63).

8. Claims 27-28, 31-34, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton et al., US Patent No 5,613,191 in view of Hall, US Pub. No 2003/0210337.

As to claim 27, Hylton et al. disclose a television attachment, comprising: a wireless interface for receiving digital video signals (col.29:2-18; col.31:10-28); a remote interface for receiving user commands (col. 32:59 – col. 33:9); and a video transcoder coupled to said digital video interface and said remote interface for converting video signals between different formats (col. 32:31-37).

Hylton et al. fail to disclose a UHF/VHF interface for transmitting analog video signals to a legacy television. However, in an analogous art, Hall discloses a television

dongle which converts a digital signal to an analog UHF television signal via a UHF re-modulator (Fig. 4:128) that connects to a television via a modulated television output (Fig. 4:38; Paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the combine the teachings of Hall and Hylton et al. The rationale for this combination would have been to produce output signals compatible with a conventional television set. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As to claim 28, in an analogous art, Hall discloses a television dongle with a wireless interface which is an IEEE 802.11(b) interface (Paragraph 43).

As to claim 31, in an analogous art, Hall discloses a television dongle with a wireless interface which is a Bluetooth interface (Paragraph 43).

As to claim 32, Hylton et al. disclose the legacy television dongle of claim 27, wherein said video transcoder receives said digital video signals from said wireless interface and translates said digital video signals into analog video signals (col. 32:31-38).

As to claim 33, Hylton et al. disclose the legacy television dongle of claim 27, wherein said wireless interface receives said user commands from said remote interface and translates said user commands into management messages using a wireless protocol (col. 32:59 – col. 33:9).

As to claim 34, in an analogous art, Hall discloses the legacy television dongle of claim 27, wherein said legacy television dongle comprises a mechanical mount for affixing said legacy television dongle to a UHF/VHF antenna connector on a legacy television (Fig. 4:128 is a UHF re-modulator that connects to a television via a modulated television output (Fig. 4:38); Paragraph 25).

As to claim 36, Hylton et al. disclose a method of receiving digital video signals on a legacy analog television using a legacy television dongle (col.29:2-18; col.31:10-28), comprising: (a) receiving a digital wireless video signal by the wireless legacy television dongle (col.29:2-18; col.31:10-28); (b) decoding the digital wireless video signal; (c) encoding an analog video signal from the digital wireless video signal (col. 32:31-38).; and (d) transmitting the analog video signal from the wireless legacy television dongle to the legacy analog television (col. 32:31-38 – DET includes video D/A converters and appropriate drivers to produce outputs compatible with conventional television sets)

Hylton et al. fail to disclose a UHF/VHF interface for transmitting analog video signals to a legacy television. However, in an analogous art, Hall discloses a television dongle which converts a digital signal to an analog UHF television signal via a UHF re-modulator (Fig. 4:128) that connects to a television via a modulated television output (Fig. 4:38; Paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the combine the teachings of Hall and Hylton et al. The rationale for this combination would have been to produce output signals compatible with a conventional television set. All the claimed

elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

9. Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton et al., US Patent No 5,613,191 in view of Hall, US Pub. No 2003/0210337 and further view of Willes et al., US Pub. No. 2005/0117052.

As to claims 29-30, while Hylton et al. disclose that communications are carried out over a wireless network, they do no specifically state which standards are being employed. In an analogous art, Willes et al. disclose a wireless video distribution network which employs IEEE protocols 802.11e and 802.15.3a (Paragraph 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the wireless protocols disclosed by Willes et al. in the system of Hylton et al. The rationale for this combination would have been to not limit the system to any one type of communication protocol. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

10. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton et al., US Patent No 5,613,191 in view of Hall, US Pub. No 2003/0210337 and further in view of Park et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0148632.

As to claim 35, Hylton et al. disclose a legacy television dongle, comprising: a wireless interface for receiving digital video signals (col.29:2-18; col.31:10-28); a remote interface for receiving user commands (col. 32:59 – col. 33:9); and a video transcoder coupled to said digital video interface and said remote interface (col. 32:31-37).

Hylton et al. fail to disclose a UHF/VHF interface for transmitting analog video signals to a legacy television. While Hylton et al. disclose converting the digital signal obtained over the wireless network to an analog signal for use with a conventional television set (col. 32:31-38), they fail to specifically disclose a UHF connection. However, in an analogous art, Hall discloses a television dongle which converts a digital signal to an analog UHF television signal via a UHF re-modulator (Fig. 4:128) that connects to a television via a modulated television output (Fig. 4:38; Paragraph 25). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the combine the teachings of Hall and Hylton et al. The rationale for this combination would have been to produce output signals compatible with a conventional television set. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Hylton et al. also fails to disclose a control signal transcoder coupled to said remote interface and said wireless interface; and a control signal database coupled to said control signal transcoder. In an analogous art, Park et al. disclose a translator coupled to said controller for translating management instructions into management messages using a preferred communications protocol (Paragraph 60-62); a device database coupled to said controller for storing device information (Paragraph 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Park et al. with the teachings of Hylton et al and Hall. The rationale for this combination would have been to use the control system disclosed by Park without having to use individual set top boxes at each television set. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT HANCE whose telephone number is (571)270-5319. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 5:00am EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LunYi Lao can be reached on (571) 272-7671. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 4134

/Lun-Yi Lao/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 434